1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *	Docket No. 10-CR-307
4		
5	*	Buffalo, New York
6		December 16, 2011 1:01 p.m.
7	* ANTHONY GALEA, *	
8	* Defendant. *	
9	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	
10		
11	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD J. ARCARA	
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
12		
13		
14	APPEARANCES:	
15	For the United States: PAUL	J. CAMPANA, ESQ.
16		stant United States Attorney
17		
18		T MALIONEY ECO and
19		J. MAHONEY, ESQ. and N H. GREENSPAN, ESQ.
20		
21		
22		
23	=	NE M. GARRISON, RPR cial Court Reporter
24	U.S.	D.C., W.D.N.Y. agara Square
25	Buff	alo, New York 14202 861-7568
_ ~		

```
1
               THE CLERK:
                          Criminal Action 2010-307A, United States
 2
    versus Anthony Galea, sentencing.
 3
               Counsel, please state your name and the party you
 4
     represent for the record.
 5
               MR. CAMPANA: Paul Campana for the United States.
               MR. MAHONEY: Judge, Mark Mahoney for Dr. Galea, and
 6
7
     also --
 8
               MR. GREENSPAN: Brian Greenspan for Dr. Galea as
 9
    well.
10
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Greenspan, I quess we
11
     admitted him the last time we were here.
12
               MR. MAHONEY: Yes, Judge, he's been admitted.
13
               THE COURT: Are we ready?
14
               MR. CAMPANA: We are.
15
               THE COURT: Mr. Mahoney?
16
               MR. MAHONEY: Yes.
               THE COURT: The defendant, Anthony Galea, stands
17
18
    before the Court for a sentencing on his previous plea of
19
    quilty to one count of introducing misbranded drugs into
20
     interstate commerce with intent to mislead an agency of the
    United States in violation of Title 21 United States Code
21
22
     Section 331(a) and 331(a)(2).
23
               I know that counsel have reviewed the report, and I
24
     assume you've gone over it with your client, Mr. Mahoney.
2.5
               MR. MAHONEY: Yes, Judge.
```

THE COURT: The Court hereby accepts the terms and conditions of the plea agreement and the plea of guilty. I will now place the presentence investigation report in the record under seal.

If an appeal is filed, counsel on appeal will be permitted access to the sealed report, except that counsel on appeal will not be permitted access to the recommendation section.

The parties have filed the appropriate statement of parties with respect to sentencing factors. I have carefully reviewed both the parties' statements with respect to sentencing factors, and have carefully considered both the parties' submissions, additional facts and circumstances that have been presented for the Court's consideration.

There is -- the parties do have some disagreement as to what the Court should consider and the weight that the Court should give to various circumstances in imposing a sentence.

And I find that they are quite different, put in a different light by the government as well as the defendant.

On the one hand, the defendant contests the absence of much allegedly mitigating information in the presentence report; and on the other hand the government alleges the defendant is affirmatively misleading the Court by downplaying the seriousness of the offense of conviction. The government does stop short of asking the Court to declare the defendant is

2.5

in breech of the plea agreement. The Court has some concerns as well, and despite the highly extraordinary volume of submissions the parties have provided to the Court, I would like to address a couple of matters.

First, it is the propriety of the two-level upward adjustment for the obstruction of justice pursuant to Guideline Section 3C1.1. The parties have agreed that -- well, the parties have agreed in the plea agreement that the defendant made false statements to border officials and that he directly caused Ms. Catalano to make false statements to border officials to disrupt the border inspection process so that the drugs could be entered into the United States. But it's not clear to me that the facts establish about the false statements to obstruct the border inspection process will support the concrete and specific findings that the Court is required by law to make in order to justify the imposition of the sentence enhancement for obstruction of a criminal investigation pursuant to 3C1.1 of the guidelines.

Mr. Campana, I'm sure you agree with me that there is an element of criminal defense of dispensing misbranded drugs that the defendant has admitted that he acted with intent to defraud an agency of the United States. And the parties detailed in the factual basis paragraph of the plea agreement that you have then stressed in your presentence submissions evidence of a series of false statements that the defendant

2.5

made at the international border at the airport in Toronto and caused Ms. Catalano to make -- to make partly because of the evidence of conduct was necessary to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant acted with knowledge and the intent to deceive an agency of the United States.

In light of that, two those factors, first, if the false statement properly understood as evidence and intent to defraud an agency of the United States are proof of the underlying offense, were they not taken into account in the base offense level prescribed by the sentencing commission that applies to misbranding offense of conviction -- the offense of conviction.

Second, if you look at application note 5(B) to the guidelines Section 3C1.1, which lists among examples of types of conduct not ordinarily to be treated as obstruction for purposes of 3C1.1 in which it lists making false statements not under oath to law enforcement officers unless the statement obstructs or impedes the official investigation or prosecution of the instant offense.

Now, federal courts in applying the guidelines have imposed long sentences in federal prison upon drug smugglers convicted under Title 21 who did not receive this enhancement even though they made false statements at the international border.

The false statements here preview within the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

heartland of the base offense level guideline in obstructing the border inspection process does not appear to be destruction of the criminal investigation in the instant offense. Now, there's a two-level adjustment here for the obstruction of justice. I'd like an explanation on that. MR. CAMPANA: Yes. THE COURT: It appears to me that there's some issue here as to whether or not that's a proper adjustment. MR. CAMPANA: Yes. It's being raised here for the first time. And what I would point out is that the plea --THE COURT: We have many cases, Mr. Campana, where individuals come in the country carrying some kind of contraband and make a false statement at the border, yet I'm not aware of those false statements ever being used as an obstruction of justice adjustment. MR. CAMPANA: Usually though, Judge, if I may respond, is that the plea is to a discrete, or in those circumstances, there's only one event and the person pleads quilty to that event and there's no other relevant conduct. Here Count 3 charges this conduct on one day. occurred on a single day as charged. However, the relevant conduct reaches back to a pattern of conduct over a couple of years where there's repeated misstatements and there's a conspiracy between Dr. Galea and Ms. Catalano. THE COURT: That's not what he pleaded guilty to

```
1
    here.
 2
               MR. CAMPANA: But he admitted it in his relevant
     conduct.
 3
 4
               THE COURT: Okay.
               MR. CAMPANA: And in the factual basis.
 5
               And because of that, or on account of that, the
 6
7
    probation officer properly invoked the application note to
 8
     reflect the obstruction that's implicit in those repeated
    events.
 9
10
               THE COURT: So you're saying it comes from the
11
     conspiracy that was admitted even though that wasn't the --
12
               MR. CAMPANA: The plea wasn't to a conspiracy.
13
               THE COURT: I'm sorry?
               MR. CAMPANA: The plea was not to a conspiracy.
14
15
               THE COURT: Right.
               MR. CAMPANA: But the relevant conduct admitted shows
16
     a pattern of deception which the application note accounts for
17
     in which the probation officer properly cited in the report.
18
               So this violation could occur --
19
20
               THE COURT: Was it the repeated activity or was it
21
     the fact that he admitted to the conspiracy?
22
               MR. CAMPANA: The obstruction is not based only upon
23
     one event. There would have been a sufficient basis to convict
24
     Dr. Galea if the only fact we had was the border crossing on
2.5
     that particular day. But, in fact, there was other relevant
```

conduct to which Dr. Galea admitted which was set forth in the factual basis. That represented a pattern of misleading, defrauding the government at the border, coming here under false pretenses, a way of committing this offense that is not typical, but which Dr. Galea admitted to. And on that basis, that application note was cited and properly, we think, to apply this adjustment.

It wasn't simply what happened at the border that day. It was a pattern of conduct that occurred from July at least of 2007, and persisted to September 14th, 2009.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Mahoney, in your submission you made statements on behalf of your client that may put the acceptance of responsibility in doubt. You indicated in your statement at page 10 you say that it is noted Dr. Galea did not believe that there was anything wrong with bringing in the medicines involved in the case.

That statement could very easily be interpreted as a post plea denial of intent to deceive the element of the offense of conviction sufficient to deny him the two-level acceptance of responsibility adjustment. I'm a little concerned about that statement.

MR. MAHONEY: Well, Judge, there's a difference between the question of the medicines in themselves, that is whether or not, for example, Nutropin or Actovegin were permitted to come in the country. That would be inconsistent

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with the mislabelling offense that's misbranding. And misbranding has nothing to do with the actual nature of the substance, but has to do with the labelling of it. So it really isn't part of the plea.

The plea doesn't really relate to the inadmissibility, if you will, of any of the medicines to come into the U.S. They have strictly to do with the labelling, but we put that in there not because it counters complete acceptance of responsibility for the offense he's pleading to and more -- clearly he agrees he did much more that was wrong -- we put that in there to sort of balance out the background concerns about some of the substances, specifically Nutropin as being associated with performance enhancement which categorically was not. And to try to put into context his belief based on, see, what was happening in the U.S. with the use of that medicine, that it would have been proper to bring the medicine in but that doesn't at all undercut the acceptance of responsibility for the labelling violation that occurred by bringing in medicine that has a label that does not conform to the regulations.

THE COURT: Mr. Campana.

MR. CAMPANA: Your Honor, I had been concerned with that issue too, but I note that first we did agree to -- to the mitigation. But in the more recent submissions I think

Dr. Galea has himself taken responsibility especially in what

was filed yesterday, a letter personally from him to the Court.

We think that that, taken together with everything else, especially since he states his remorse for putting

Ms. Catalano in harm's way, we think that in practical terms he has accepted responsibility, although I had been concerned with the earlier submissions that we believed and have said unduly minimized the conduct.

MR. MAHONEY: And, Judge, I would say probably will never do enough to try to draw the distinction between the arguments that counsel make regarding some of the finer points here and the underlying feelings about the defendant who has not only made his plea before Your Honor, has cooperated with the government, and he has expressed to us and in the letter — the letter he had sent to you — we delivered to you — really reflects what he's been saying all along. His real take is on this is, not necessarily reflected the in the lawyerly discussion about the finer points of what the implications are of the details behind this plea.

THE COURT: All right. I carefully read all the submissions of the parties and the presentence report and the Court will be adopting the facts in the report as its findings of fact and incorporate them in the record.

I know that you take issue with some of the statements that's in the record. Those submissions are part of the record. And if any further discussion, they're available,

but I'm not going to change the presentence report.

There are no objections to the probation officer's conclusions as to the applicable guidelines. The report recommends that the base offense level under Guideline Section 2N2.1(c)(1), and 2B1.1(a)(2) is 6.

The report also recommends a six-level upward adjustment pursuant to 2B1.1(b)(1)(D) as the payments for goods and services require government regulation but did not exceed \$30,000, but was less than \$70,000.

The report also recommends a two-level upward adjustment pursuant to 3B1.1(c), as the defendant was an organizer, leader, manager or supervisor in criminal activity.

The report also recommends a two-level upward adjustment pursuant to 3B1.3 as the defendant used a special skill in a manner that significantly facilitated the commission of the offense.

The report also recommends a two-level upward adjustment pursuant a 3C1.1 that he in -- the report recommends a two-level upward adjustment pursuant to 3C1.1 as the defendant willfully or impeded or attempted to obstruct, impede the administration of justice.

The Court will not impose the obstruction of justice enhancement in this case on the grounds that contrary to the government's position today, that the false statement was not made under oath, it was made to border inspectors, were not

2.5

made in the course of the official criminal investigation and did not obstruct the official criminal investigation.

The report also recommends a three-level downward adjustment for acceptance of responsibility. I will accept that and will calculate the offense level of 13, criminal history category I with an advisory range of 12 to 18 months.

However, the government has also filed a motion for a two-level departure under 5K1.1 for substantial assistance in the investigation and prosecution of others who may have committed offenses, and pursuant to 5K2.0 due to the defendant's waiver of extradition and voluntary surrender in the United States to enter into the plea agreement.

The Court will grant the request for the two-level downward departure pursuant -- as I just indicated. This puts us at offense level 11, criminal history category of I, with an advisory guideline range of eight to fourteen months. The advisory range for supervised release remains at one year. The advisory range for a fine is 2,000 to \$20,000, plus the cost of imprisonment and supervised release.

In accordance with the Supreme Court decision U.S. versus Booker and the Second Circuit decision U.S. versus Crosby, this Court must consider the guidelines but is not bound by them. The Court must also consider the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. 3553(a).

Now, I have received, according to my count, it was

```
about 123 letters. I might add made my life last night quite late trying to go through all these letters, and I read every single one of them. I note that there was -- I didn't receive any letters -- I'm not saying there should have been any letters -- from any active professional athlete. I take this as not any sign of lack of support for the defendant, but I do conclude that it may reflect the desire to avoid potential controversy and notoriety. As I stated, I considered all the filings of the parties.
```

The letters -- I've been a judge for 23, 24 years and I receive letters, that number in the past, but I think that kind of really impressed me so much was the variety of the letters, who they came from: Peers, patients, every day patients, not the so-called -- I guess there's one hockey player that commented but most of the individuals just everyday citizens who just work very hard. They certainly are a testament to what this doctor has done over the years. It's unfortunate that he finds himself in this situation today, but he's got no one to blame but himself.

All right. Mr. Mahoney.

MR. MAHONEY: Thank you, Judge.

As you have anticipated, I'm sure, Mr. Greenspan and I are going to sort of split up our presentation. I just want to address in my own way the question of a non-guideline sentence and some of the factors that have build into that, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

then Mr. Greenspan will sort of address the area of which is more covered, say, in the letters from friends and family and patients and so on. I'll to be -- kept it very brief and I know he will as well. Although I've assured both him and Dr. Galea the Court makes it clear that it's not in a rush to get through this sort of thing. And also, Your Honor --THE COURT: You're not going to read the 123 letters. MR. MAHONEY: No, no. THE COURT: Thank you. MR. MAHONEY: And, you know I, just want you to know that I was asked: Well, is the judge going to read all these letters; and based on my experience with you, I told him without any hesitation that you read every one of these letters and that you have commented more than once on how often you get useful and important information from these letters that help round out the picture of the person who appears before you. And I -- and I -- it's already evident that that's the case here. I just wanted to, Judge, let you know who is -- there are a number of people here in the courtroom that I think it's helpful to the Court to know who is attending. To both of Tony's parents Joseph and Francis are here, his sister Janet, Janet Kermy (phonetic) is here, his nephews are here, his

wife's father, Zorn Bovanovich (phonetic) is present, his

sister-in-law Nina Bovanovich is here.

Your Honor, you may recall -- I'm sure you recall a particular letter from Stacy Sharon from Atlanta, the woman who -- whose basically life was changed by Tony's efforts. She was disabled with chronic pain with conditions that other doctors were not able to help her with. And she tells the story, and what I think is probably the best letter I think I've ever seen submitted on behalf of a defendant about how he has changed her life.

She is here with her parents today from Atlanta,

Judge. Mark McCoy is Tony's business partner. He was an

Olympic gold medalist '92 Barcelona games. He was a patient,

best friend. Jennifer Ruppel (phonetic) is a family friend.

You mentioned the hockey player, Ty Domi is here in the

courtroom today following up on his letter to the Court. Mark

Lindsay (phonetic) who's a highly regarded, well-known

chiropractor in the world of sports medicine is present. His

good friend and patient came in, Damian Dodd (phonetic) is

here, Jeff Dyer (phonetic) is a patient who flew in from Los

Angeles to be here, Bess and Jacob Bauer (phonetic) two family

friends, and John Chism (phonetic), and other patients.

And I just want you to know Mr. Greenspan reminded me today that they actually discouraged people from coming down to the courthouse today. This isn't a demonstration for Your Honor's benefit. It just was an indication that these are

1 people that are -- care very much.

2.5

Oh, I'm sorry, of course his wife Nella is present as well, Judge.

THE COURT: I note that his ex-wife actually wrote a letter too.

MR. MAHONEY: We could only hope, many of us do, that we would have that kind of support.

Well, I'll try to not extend things too much what I have to say. But, you know, in our presentation to you, Judge, we could have pretended that this is a simple case of misbranding and a 331 violation, and looked at it strictly that way.

And I think Mr. Campana is correct to point out it's a multifaceted case. There are a lot of issues behind it. The plea agreement is compromised in many ways. And there's — there is the larger picture that we tried to address. And some of that was because there was a lot of sensational and false media reports in connection with his arrest quite predictably given the kinds of patients that Dr. Galea has had which refer to things like performance enhancement and doping. And I just thought it important that we made it clear — the government's also made it very clear that's not what this case is about, that's not what Dr. Galea has ever been about. He's been into exclusively on healing injuries for patients using the best and most advanced means.

```
1
               THE COURT: Some of the drugs were enhancements,
    weren't they?
 2
 3
               MR. MAHONEY: No.
               THE COURT: They were used for healing purpose.
 4
               MR. MAHONEY: Absolutely.
 5
               THE COURT: But they were used in other, I guess --
 6
7
     used in some other capacity. Somebody else may use them for a
 8
    different purpose.
 9
              MR. MAHONEY: Exactly.
               THE COURT: But there's no evidence that I saw that
10
11
     it was used in this case.
12
              MR. MAHONEY: No. And the government's never
13
     suggested it, and I think they made it clear, as we do.
               THE COURT: Well, the letters and again, I'm not
14
15
     going to speak on your behalf, Mr. Mahoney, it seems like his
16
    main goal as a physician is to be a healer.
17
               MR. MAHONEY: That's his dedication, Judge.
               THE COURT: I think I've seen that word countless
18
19
     times in all those letters from various people.
20
               I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you.
              MR. MAHONEY: No, that's fine.
21
22
               And one comment I should make, we avoided naming
    particular patients for the -- generally for the most part
23
24
    because there are privacy concerns in terms of him revealing
2.5
    treatments to patients. So that's one of the reasons why we
```

2.5

don't really have a -- you know, identified individual patients and the treatments that they've had, but we went to some effort to outline for you what kind of treatments really are at issue here and maybe in detail. I'm certainly not going to go over now but just try to inform you of what all this was about.

But obviously this is a case that involves sort of an extreme kind of contrast. You know, we have a person about whom so many positive things can be said and have been said, who is a truly good person, a truly outstanding physician, and we have all the support in the world for that and he has his own record and his achievements for individual patients to attest to that. But in the midst of this, to contrast with that, we have somebody who partly because of it, because of his dedication to his patients and his single-mindedness in that regard made some terrible choices which he not only regrets but he's acknowledged were wrong about which he's very embarrassed today.

And, luckily, none of this was consequential for him. Nobody was hurt, nobody was intended to be hurt, people were healed, good things were done. But in order to do that, he disregarded very important and significant rules, not just at the border, but rules in terms of what substances and treatments are permitted and licensing requirements for physicians.

And what began as, I think, an innocent, although

partly maybe more naive effort, to accommodate some patients who weren't able to travel to Canada, almost all of his patients were established patients at his clinic in Toronto, but there were occasions where, for various reasons, patients asked him to come to see them here in the United States, and it became a slippery slope for him.

He made efforts to try to figure out the licensing requirements, and actually it's fairly simple in one sense. A physician from Canada is entirely permitted in every state to provide treatment to somebody in the United States whether they're a preexisting patient or not, if they work under the supervision of a physician licensed in that state.

And there were initially efforts to comply with that, but it became something that just did not fit the urgency, the traveling schedule, and he was not exiguous -- was not exiguous about it and was careless. He made efforts to actually get licensed in the United States in Colorado and people were helping him with that. It didn't happen quickly enough.

He made efforts to get associated with a clinic in the U.S. and, you know, on paper that was happening, but it didn't happen quickly enough. He made efforts to get a visa, a proper visa, which he'd be eligible for, clearly an O-1 visa where he'd be able to come into the country for the specific purpose of providing these kind of medical treatments, but he -- his activities, though, took him beyond that and it was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

something which I think essentially got out of hand. He was unable to say no to patients because he knew he could help them and others couldn't. And experienced, I think, an increasing anxiety over the fact that he was not in compliance with these rules and was giving into his need to take care of these patients.

THE COURT: Well, he considered himself above the law, Mr. Mahoney?

MR. MAHONEY: I think -- obviously that's an easy way to characterize this. I think it was more of an naivety, Judge, with an arrogance that he felt his mission was -- it was so important to him, and healing was so important to him that, you know, on -- it may be on the same scale, you know, we're familiar with people crossing the border and being -- saying they're going to the mall because they don't want to say that they're going to the strip club. This is quite a different kind of thing. But I think it's more on that level than somebody who felt he was above the law because in many -- which is maybe why I put in our sentencing memorandum some of the finer points about why he would have thought that Nutropin was permissible, these treatments were permissible in U.S.; not to quibble but to say, yes, there's this aspect of acting above the law, but I don't think it was an arrogance. I think it was a -- a subduing those concerns to -- in giving preference to or giving focus on the immediate problem of a patient who was in

2.5

some need where they couldn't come to Toronto and needed his assistance, and putting it aside -- the concern aside about the regulations.

I can't argue too much with -- acting above the law. He certainly acted that way. But I think in trying to understand the mentality, I think it's merely that the situation got out of hand.

THE COURT: Well, he made quite a large number of trips.

MR. MAHONEY: I know it got -- that's what I mean by saying it was a slippery slope. He got started on this and was not -- and he should have -- he knows now how not only foolish it was, how wrong it was, and he has agonized over this, Judge, not just because of the trouble it's caused him, but because he realizes it doesn't even -- it's not even consistent with his own moral code, it's not professional, and it's the hugest embarrassment to him.

It's difficult -- it's very difficult. You know, he's acknowledging this publicly. It's a very difficult thing. But from the very outset in my first meetings with him, it's been evident to me that it weighed on him heavily that he made such bad choices. And he, of course, with good intentions rather than the legal intentions, but he realizes fully that that's just not an excuse, doesn't justify what he did, and he's embarrassed to the extreme.

2.5

THE COURT: And he brought another person involved here.

MR. MAHONEY: Yes, Judge. And I have to say, you know, from the very outset also, this is the first sort of public forum for this, but he knew this and it weighed on him heavily.

THE COURT: I was waiting to see whether there was going to be any acknowledgment on what harm he caused that young lady who is his assistant who's now a felon under the laws of the United States. And she appeared in front of me. I gave her one year probation. She appeared to be about as sweet of a person as you can ever imagine. And this obviously has changed her life dramatically. And she had so much confidence and trust in the doctor that she did what she was told, and now she's got to live with the felony conviction of the laws of the United States which is just terrible that woman is now suffering under that conviction. She can't come to the United States without permission. And it's just -- and her whole life has changed dramatically. I don't know what she's doing today.

And I -- when I saw that letter last night, that came in I guess late yesterday afternoon, because nothing acknowledged that, nothing -- and I was a little surprised, and when I got that last night I thought it was a factor that was important to me because of all the damage he did to that young woman.

MR. MAHONEY: I can tell you, Judge, that from my very first meetings with Tony, it was clear that this was something which he has never -- he has never complained to either me or Brian about all the things -- we talk about the things he's gone through. He's never complained about it. He understands he's brought this on himself, but he is -- but this -- and I can see that that's the most heartfelt paragraph in that letter, and I think that is a concern that has been at the forefront from the very beginning.

THE COURT: Mr. Mahoney, how can you get -- obviously your client is a renowned physician. He's done great work. He's brilliant. I think someone indicated that he's in the top one percent in his field. I wish someone would you say that I was in the top one percent of all the judges in the United States but that's not going to happen. But it just -- I just -- a man who was so brilliant and the statements that were made how sensitive he is, he's a role model, he's a healer, high moral character, treated his patients, everyday citizens like they were -- and he had such care for them; he had such a concern about their well-being. I think a little bit more beyond the average physician today.

It's kind of unusual reading some of that. And I was reading it from everyday citizens that I said, from his colleagues. I mean, his colleagues that wrote on his behalf are -- couldn't be more complimentary. He was a gold standard.

Deeply spiritual. What was he thinking to find himself in violating the laws of the United States? I mean, the FDA has these restrictions as to what can come into the country, and I know you take issue with some of that in your submissions, but the FDA has a very important job in caring for the welfare of the citizens of this country that quack doctors or quacks -- quack doctors -- people that -- medicine men or whatever don't bring their great stuff that it does more harm. It's an unbelievable task that the FDA has with so many new substances and things coming out today that I'm sure they're burdened very heavily in trying to deal with all these new substances that are being created every day.

But I know that you somewhat take issue with some of these substances really are accepted and all that, but it's against the law of the United States, and until the law changes that's the law. And we do live in a country where we have to abide by the laws, whether you're a citizen of the country or whether you're an outsider who comes into our country; the same as if we go to a foreign country, we would have to abide by the laws of those countries. And you looking around the world there are many cultures that have, I think, some things that we obviously would not accept as Americans, but that's their culture and we can't change it unless they change it.

So the idea that here's this brilliant physician who was apparently made inroads into this area of pain control that

done so much that we just run this risk. Look at the embarrassment he's caused himself, his family, all the -- he's been on many panels and many different -- all these different professions he's been accepted very well.

To some degree now he's being rejected. And certainly he's suffering more. And I just can't imagine how he put himself in this position. It's just mind boggling to me that someone with this gift would not take the extra steps to make sure that he is compliant with the laws of a different country.

MR. MAHONEY: Judge, I think there's no easy answer to that, but for me the answer, having known Dr. Galea for two years now, I think the answer is that what causes that understanding from people about his dedication to healing and what has produced the results that he has seen for his patients is the single minded deal on behalf of the patients. And that when it came up that patients needed him here in the U.S., they couldn't come to Toronto, I think he just pushed other concerns to the side.

And he realized -- you know, again, it was not evil, it wasn't a plan. He didn't start out with a plan to violate the laws or do anything unlawful. The plan was to help the patient, and he was cognizant of the need to comply with the rules and made some efforts that were not complete and not thorough.

2.5

I don't think that's to say it's not an easy explanation, but the very zeal and dedication of the patient that results in these letters to you, and this I think correct understanding you have of his persona, was what -- was maybe the flaw that allowed him to put these concerns aside where other people that were less dedicated, less intensely focussed on the patient would have put these concerns more to the forefront. But it's the same thing that results in him not charging a lot of patients for --

THE COURT: Well, I noticed in a lot of the letters that he was more concerned with the patients than to earn a fee.

MR. MAHONEY: Yeah.

THE COURT: It seemed to be not a dry word. That's what I'm saying is here's a man who's like -- almost like, I guess when I go back in my life I think about Marcus Welby who used to be a TV doctor that you always looked up to. I don't know if we have many of those today. The profession, the medical profession has changed dramatically in my lifetime. And yet you've got a man who reminded me to some degree in reading all this, reading the reports and all the submissions that somebody has a very unusual quality.

MR. MAHONEY: I actually on one visit up to

Dr. Galea's clinic there were two physicians there, one a

father; one's from Niagara Falls. He's been a rheumatologist

2.5

for about 35 years there, and his son who practices in Chicago. After hearing a five-minute conversation with Dr. Galea at a recent presentation or symposium, they closed down the practices for two days and came to Toronto to watch Dr. Galea. And the father mentioned to me that in ten minutes with Dr. Galea he learned like 20 things that he -- in 35 years he had not learned as a rheumatologist. And the significance of that, to me, was not only with how other physicians regarded him, but that what he is doing is relevant, not just to sports medicine but the areas like treating arthritis and other conditions that affect the joints.

So I agree with everything you said, Judge. There's no simple answer to it. It's the kind of, I think his single-minded zeal for his patients and maybe a naivety which he certainly shed at this point.

He's been through it, he gets it, he understands now, and he's not just remorseful because of the impact it has had on him and could have on him, but because of the effect on -- you know, what will his patients do if he can't take care of them, what will his family do. And, again, what has also been a major concern situation, as you pointed out, of the position he put Mary Anne Catalano in. And I know that that's the thing for which he is most embarrassed and most remorseful about as he stands before you today.

I guess the final thing I wanted to address, Judge,

is very simply, because I think it's -- it's quite obvious that the -- the sentencing guideline setup here under Section 331 of Title 21 covers a broad range of conduct, and it would cover the quack doctors, it would cover people bringing in unsafe medicines, it would cover bringing in the huckster of steroids selling them to adolescents to help build muscles in the gym. It would cover those kinds of individuals. And that's -- the guideline range we end up with here with all its enhancements is a guideline range that is suitable for that kind of person. And it does not take into account, and I think I can say with confidence --

THE COURT: Well, that type of person you're describing, maybe a guideline of above the guideline range would be appropriate.

MR. MAHONEY: But they have the same guideline range even if you sentenced them above it. So my point is as a starting point -- the sentencing guideline range in this case doesn't really take into account the dramatic contrast between that core behavior that's of concern which includes -- the guideline range includes not just misbranding but also adulteration, meaning drugs are supposed to be sterile which are not drugs, are supposed to be from legitimate pharmaceutical sources which are not, and on and on and on.

And certainly doesn't contemplate the physician who takes widely accepted homeopathic medications using them to

```
1
     treat injuries successfully that others could not do. And I
 2
     think it just -- that certainly was -- is probably not what the
     congress had in mind the 331 and certainly not with the
 3
    quidelines commission had in adopting the quideline range for
 4
           There's no adjustments up or down based upon how, you
 5
 6
     know, good the product is or what, you know, it's being used
 7
     for accepted medical purpose. The quidelines just don't --
 8
    don't take into account those things.
               So I think that for especially a first time offender,
 9
10
     under these circumstances, we have a quideline range of
11
     starting out, sets a range which is, in my view, clearly
12
     greater than necessary in cases which could fall within
     Section 331.
13
14
               THE COURT: Mr. Campana disagrees with you.
15
               MR. MAHONEY: Well, I think, in my view, the
16
     government also always takes the position in every case
17
     where there's a plea agreement that the sentencing guideline
18
     range -- a sentence within the quideline range is appropriate.
19
     I haven't seen the government deviate from that in any case --
20
               THE COURT:
                          Well, they have. I've had cases.
21
               MR. MAHONEY: Well --
22
               THE COURT: You have never seen it, but I have.
23
               MR. MAHONEY: I'm just unlucky in that regard, I
24
     quess, but maybe it's me. But I think that it's -- it's no
25
     surprise to me the government's saying, you know, it's -- the
```

guidelines sentence is appropriate. And -- but I point out that when the government did take that position in their response to our objections, it was without regard without at all taking into account all of the mitigating factors in the case, at least not expressly so; perhaps it was. But I think that, you know, the reality of it is, I think that when we strike a deal with the government, a plea agreement, I always expect the government to say that they -- they believe that a guideline sentence is appropriate even though they've allowed the defendant to argue for a non-guideline sentence below the range, just as they preserve for themselves an opportunity to argue for a sentence above the guidelines range. So I just think it's appropriate to point that out.

And, Your Honor, I think that obviously our papers outline for you what you already know and can easily tell. There's been a great deal of punishment exacted already on Dr. Galea even if the forfeiture in this case was a civil forfeiture. In technical terms, forfeiture is a traditional punishment. He has his license at risk, his reputation is extremely damaged, he's lost career opportunities.

And so you've already mentioned, alluded to the consequences of incarceration here for his employees, for his patients. I do believe that what we've said in our sentencing memorandum that a sentence of commitment would be greater than necessary to achieve the legitimate purpose of the sentencing

here. And I think that even in the context of general deterrence, there aren't many other people like Dr. Anthony Galea contemplating coming across the border to treat patients in U.S. for the -- for the positive reasons that he did that we have to worry about here in terms of deterring. And I think that this case is a case unique case. I haven't seen a case like this.

I would ask Your Honor to also note though as a more technical point, that given the range -- the new range that we have, this is a range where a lot of times the Court would figure out a sentence which would allow confinement to be home confinement, for example, in this range. And, in fact, that's just not available because he's a Canadian citizen. There are options that are not open to the Court in terms of sentencing because of the fact that he's not a U.S. resident and citizen.

So I certainly would request that the Court -- in my view, a sentence of -- without incarceration is a sentence which also would not require supervision which I think typically does not occur with Canadian defendants, but I point out that as long as Dr. Galea is under any kind of supervision, it will effectively prevent him from taking the steps -- the initial steps toward trying to get -- seek permission, official permission, to enter the U.S. for authorized purposes.

So that the longer that there's any period of supervision, even if it's unsupervised probation, that will

There

```
1
     delay his ability to seek permission to enter the U.S. and seek
 2
     status in the U.S. and so on.
 3
               Just a personal story, Judge, if I may, before I turn
     it over to Brian. Your Honor may know I'm a cyclist. I do a
 4
 5
     lot of bike riding a couple of times --
               THE COURT: You're a kayaker too.
 6
 7
              MR. MAHONEY: Yes, Judge.
 8
               THE COURT: See you --
 9
              MR. MAHONEY: It's my job, Judge, to intrude on other
10
    people.
11
               So we've done some bike riding together. He's a very
12
     good cyclist, and we were out riding in September, and there
13
    was a huge ride of riders coming in the opposite direction.
    And what it was there was a woman whose husband was an Ontario
14
15
     Provincial Police officer who's was on a bicycle and struck by
16
     a motorist and killed. And she began a local chapter in
    Ontario of -- a program called "Share the Road" which is
17
18
    basically to increase awareness about bicycle safety and have
19
    vehicles be aware of cyclists.
20
               And this particular event involved police officers
21
    participating in a ride. And there were, I would say about 200
22
    police officers for the Ontario Provincial Police on this ride.
23
    And they jerseys show the different -- that they were police
24
    officers and so on.
```

So we were -- we stopped at an intersection.

2.5

some letters there.

were about three or four of us. And this ride goes by -- and now bear in mind the way you're cycling you have sunglasses on, and a helmet, and you have, you know cycling clothing on. It's not that easy to recognize somebody. But as they're going by, I would say about 20 percent of the police officers on their bicycles were shouting out Dr. G, Tony, Dr. Galea. And I said, Tony, what's up with all these cops that are saying hi to you. And he basically -- he treats -- when police officers come in and they're not covered by whatever, he treats them for free. He's treated a lot of these people.

THE COURT: We got letters from them. There were

MR. MAHONEY: Yeah. I mean, I was blown away by this, Judge. And, again, you can imagine, not many of my clients get that kind of treatment from police officers. But it so typifies what you remarked on earlier, that the perception of people they have of him it's genuine, it's deep and it has to do with the kind of person that he really is.

And I've got to say that I, like so many people, feel very fortunate to have the opportunity to meet him, and I think that come through in all the letters.

So, Your Honor, if I may permit Brian Greenspan to address you at this point and then perhaps if at that point if Mr. Campana has something to say, perhaps we could hear and a chance, if we need to, to respond to something he says and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

allow Dr. Galea to go at that point. I don't know if that would --

THE COURT: Well, the defense will go first.

MR. GREENSPAN: Thank you, Mark.

First of all, Your Honor, I'd like to express my appreciation for the opportunity to address you. It's a privilege for which we're grateful.

The personal perspective is someone who grew up 17 miles downstream on the Canadian side of Niagara. I was always influenced greatly by Buffalo by listening to Chuck Healy on the broadcast from Buffalo and coming back from the stadium to watch the Bisons. But as many people of my generation, we were most influenced by our view of America by something that was said by President Kennedy when he addressed the Canadian Parliament in 1961 in terms of the relationship which our countries shared. President Kennedy said: geography of its neighbors history that made us friends, economics that made us partners, and necessity has made us allies; what unites us is far greater than what divides us. Indeed, what's basically fundamental by our legal cultures is our principles of fundamental justice is decremented (phonetic) in decisions; what unites us is far greater than what divides us.

Yet when I address you on behalf Dr. Galea, I do so with some trepidation, for I do so with both greatest respect

2.5

for Your Honor and for the courts of the United States and for the system of justice of the United States, but I also do so as a Canadian lawyer with a Canadian perspective.

Last weekend Justice Morris Fish of the Supreme

Court -- of the Supreme Court of Canada spoke in Toronto to the

Criminal Lawyers Association annual convention. And he's one

of Canada's most distinguished jurists and criminal lawyers who

was on the Court of Appeals of Quebec and one of the most

distinguished members of the criminal bar of Quebec before his

elevation to the Supreme Court happened.

He devoted a significant portion of his remarks to what he said were the most fundamental policies and principles of sentencing in Canada. And he talked about the concept, the age-old concept of lex talionis and said that lex talionis really meant proportionality tempered by restraint. And proportionality tailored with not only to the specific circumstances of the offense, by taking into account the oftentimes unique characteristics, feelings and contributions of the offender.

And as far as I can understand, Your Honor, very much the concept of a sentence in the United States that is no greater than necessary, which I understand to be a fundamental principle of sentencing in this country.

I want to very briefly discuss with you -- and very brief -- because quite frankly my task has been significantly

reduced by what is clear, and as Your Honor has expressed, your very, very clear understanding of all the letters, the sentiments expressed, high praise for not only his talent, his dedication, but his focus on the healing arts as being so fundamental to his person. But he is a person that's made a major contribution, not only to the health and welfare of his community, but he's someone who in the world known in the Canadian world of sports medicine but the world's world of sports medicine is really continued to make a significant contribution on so many levels.

In the materials that Mr. Mahoney filed on behalf of Dr. Galea, there is a section near the end that reviews these letters of support and occasionally quotes from them. And in many ways it's mentally representative of those sentiments. As you expressed, many of his colleagues viewing him as being among the one or two top -- one or two percent of the top of his profession were the most sought after experts by physicians, athletes, patients around the world. And that international reputation is not only shared by physicians in Canada in the United States, but a whole host of physicians as you saw where he's made such an important contribution in the state of Israel to injured soldiers and people who have had significant injuries.

As well as what's perhaps of significance is that people have been prepared to come forward. And I want to make

2.5

it clear we decided quite intentionally not to seek out the athletes and the well-known celebrities who he has treated and assisted in their rehabilitation over the years. We intentionally didn't seek out those people. And, in fact, we rarely solicited these letters. These letters -- most of these letters at least were letters from the heart from people who volunteered. And indeed to this day our office receives on a continuing basis, almost a daily basis, the offers of assistance, the offers of letters, the offers of support from a wide variety of people in the Toronto and in the Canadian community.

Team coaches and sports owners and indeed you saw that former owner of the Toronto Argonauts, the Canadian football league said that of Dr. Galea: I can honestly say I've never met a more compassionate, dedicated, intelligent, loyal and authentic individual in all my life. And as you probably noted, that same owner dedicated a very impressive sculpture at the Sheba Medical Center in Tel Hashomer, Israel in honor of Dr. Galea. This is the type of person who really in terms of his compassion, his dedication, his devotion to his profession and to his patients really is in many ways a Canadian treasure.

In this country, people of real significance, people who themselves are great Americans as you saw from Bestor (phonetic) Young, retired Rear Admiral Carey who from

```
the heart advised Your Honor, advised the public, advised
1
 2
    whoever is prepared to read that this is -- and I'm quoting per
 3
    Admiral Carey -- a man truly of exceptional character, a person
 4
    who, through expansive charitable work and giving back to
 5
    society is almost without equal. Calls him a patriot. I'm not
    sure of what country. I think perhaps a patriot of the world.
 6
7
    And he's a patriot with commitment to his faith and religion
 8
    and father caring for his seven children.
               THE COURT: Why is there so much adverse publicity?
 9
10
    Why was this case received a lot of unflattering reporting?
11
               MR. GREENSPAN: In my view, and I say this with
12
    respect to the fifth estate, and that is that what occurred
13
    from the outset was the desire to explode this case into a case
    of the misuse of drugs. It wasn't understood properly.
14
15
    thought to be a case of performance enhancement. And
16
    performance enhancement is always been defined as bigger,
    stronger, faster. And this case has nothing to do with bigger,
17
18
    faster or stronger. It is only something to do --
19
               THE COURT: Do you have any evidence to support that
20
    otherwise, what he's just saying?
21
              MR. CAMPANA: No, Your Honor. We never took the
22
    position, and we don't, that Dr. Galea's intent was to make
23
    athletes bigger, faster and stronger.
24
               THE COURT: I've read nothing that would suggest that
25
    and that's why I was -- I asked the question why did this
```

1 receive such widespread unflattering reporting. 2 MR. GREENSPAN: And, Your Honor, regrettably when reads that unflattering reporting, the inference to be drawn 3 from it was that in some way Dr. Galea was engaged in conduct 4 in which he categorically was not engaged in. 5 So that it's a misrepresentation of the type of 6 7 activities in which he engaged his --- not only his intent, his 8 actual acts and actions were always the person presented with an injury, that was first and foremost the premise of what 9 10 occurred. 11 He presented with an injury, he presented with a 12 deficiency, and it was an attempt to address that injury or 13 deficiency from a solid and sound medical perspective. That was his only intent and the only expectation of the athletes 14 15 that he dealt with. If you take a look at some of the 16 publicity --THE COURT: These treatments did receive -- there 17 18 were some controversy as far as the treatments are concerned. 19 MR. GREENSPAN: Well, this is --20 THE COURT: I mean, there is some within the medical 21 profession. 22

MR. GREENSPAN: There is a debate about the efficacy of some of the treatments. And indeed, let me be very candid, five years ago when Dr. Galea was at the cutting edge of PRP treatments, platelet rich plasma treatments, there was

23

24

25

2.5

controversy about PRP. There was a controversy particularly in America about the use of PRP. Now, it's standard practice.

Every major league baseball player who has a rotator cuff injury goes to American physicians who in their clinics are utilizing PRP in a widespread basis. Some of whom, five years ago, were critical of Dr. Galea who then was at the cutting edge of PRP and one of the first promoters and pioneers of its use.

That's why the Steadman Clinic wanted him. That's what the Steadman Clinic was talking about in terms of being the leader in the area of regeneration and in terms of muscle and tendon injuries.

So that that type of leading and current research and leading edge is what Dr. Galea's always been the best. He's pushed the envelope in terms of thinking and in terms of new research, but it's always sound and has only one objective, the art of healing, and that's really his life's work and the dedication that he's demonstrated throughout his life.

At the same time, and I don't want to in any way suggest in any way that Dr. Galea shins from the acceptance of his responsibility for the offense, his shame, his regret, sincere remorse, and I -- Your Honor's read the letter that he provided. That letter, again, as Mr. Mahoney has said, he expressed it privately countless times and now publicly and I think quite insightfully in the letter to Your Honor, he

expresses his remorse, regret and shame.

2.5

Mr. Mahoney has talked about some of the collateral damage, the risk to his licensing, the fact that he's already sustained some significant damage to his reputation, the removal from various associations, the suspension in his teaching role in many areas that hopefully will be restored in the very near future.

And I needn't read excerpts, but I do think that and it's the belated -- the one letter that was received as Your Honor pointed out from one professional athlete, a retired professional athlete, who's present in Court, Ty Domi. And one of the interesting aspects of Mr. Domi's very thorough and articulate and insightful letter, he talks about Dr. Galea as a brilliant physician, the medical innovator, one of the most caring, compassionate and dedicated individuals I know. He's someone who said that he was in a privileged position and privileged life as a professional athlete. He met many extraordinary medical specialists, and Dr. Galea perhaps the best.

He says while he appreciates the serious nature of the charges against Dr. Galea, I also urge you to take into account Dr. Galea's track record of compassion, of his service to his patients, and the impact that charges against him have had on this gentle man and his family.

And it led me to think about, and I've occasionally

2.5

in my career reverted to -- not a reliance on but an analogy to the Judeo Christian concept of the book of life and debits and credits in one's life, and almost like a lecture in some ways.

And Dr. Galea at no point in his life had ever thought that he'd have to call upon the credits.

The credits in his life were heartfelt, they were sincere, they were part of who he is, and yet he built up that wealth of credit that his life's work has provided and the caring that he's had throughout his life has given to him.

And I say with great respect that at some time, and it's only right and proper that, you know, imposing a sentence no greater than necessary, that the credit side in mitigation is exhausted, is fully exhausted. Anthony Galea will never again have to utilize the credit side of the ledger. It's time to utilize it in my respectful submission to Your Honor in mitigation of the sentence, and we ask that a non-custodial sentence be imposed.

Thank you for your consideration, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Galea, this is your opportunity, sir, to say anything you'd like to say.

THE DEFENDANT: First I want to apologize to the United States of America for violating the laws and regulations. I want to apologize to the government; the FDA for violating its rules and regulations; to the FBI for causing so much grief in the investigation; to the Department of

1.3

2.5

Homeland Security for violating their trust in me coming across.

I would also like to apologize to Mary Anne Catalano and her family for the turmoil I caused them, but specifically I want to apologize to her mom and dad and her grandfather who entrusted her well-being to my hands and I blew it. And I'll never forgive myself for that.

I'd like to apologize to my wife and family and friends for my overzealousness in trying to heal the pain in others and their injuries. I caused a lot of suffering and pain in the ones I love, and that's tough. And that's it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Campana.

MR. CAMPANA: Thank you, Judge.

A minute ago the Court asked about the government's view concerning the issue of performance enhancement. And there are two halves to that answer. One is we don't allege that Dr. Galea intended to enhance the performance of his patients when they were athletes to make them bigger, faster and stronger, but he did know that at least one of the treatments that was given involved a substance that was banned by the sports leagues they played in.

So in addition to putting Ms. Catalano in a very difficult position, he did put these athletes in a position where they were out of compliance with the rules of the sports

2.5

they played, and we regard that as a serious thing too.

But generally, Judge, what we had here is a case -and just to review the facts without a lot of detail.

Dr. Galea started coming here for one purpose and then
continued to do it on a large scale, numerous times. And the
Court referred to the mission of the FDA as being a very
important job, an awesome task were the mission of the FDA is
to ensure the health and safety of people who live in the
United States. And the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act is designed
to make sure that medications are safe, and there's rules and
regulations for that.

But there's another agency, and Dr. Galea mentioned this, and that's Homeland Security. They have a mission too.

And their mission is to be sure that inspecting everyone who enters the United States enters for a lawful purpose. And Dr. Galea undermined that purpose as well as the purpose of the FDA on many times, many occasions; more than 150.

And Dr. Galea indeed is a -- is a skilled physician. But it's not enough to do things well. It's necessary that they be done lawfully. And we have laws that are designed to ensure that.

For that reason, Your Honor, we ask the Court to impose the sentence within the guideline range you found, because we think that would be the sentence that would ensure respect for the law and to ensure that there isn't undue

1 disparity. 2 Thank you. THE COURT: Well, you say undue disparity, 3 Mr. Campana, there's a lot of factors that have to be taken 4 5 into consideration; the 3553 factors. So there's -- it's unwarranted disparity, a disparity that seems to shock one's 6 7 conscious and that's what the sentencing commission has 8 considered it. I'm going to ask you a tough question: Why do you 9 10 feel that justice would be better served to put him in prison 11 for, let's say, a year? 12 What would that accomplish in the -- in the interest 13 of justice, why is the United States serve -- what would the United States benefit by that? Here you have a man, and I'm 14 not suggesting what I'm going to do right now, okay, but here 15 you have a man -- and you've got all those letters, I'm sure. 16 17 MR. CAMPANA: I did. 18 THE COURT: Okay. It wasn't an easy task. 19 believe me, it wasn't, but there was -- I didn't see anything 20 at all anywhere in the report to disagree with anything that was said in those letters. 21 22 Now, there's one thing about the legal aspects of it, 23 you know, you violated the law, there's no question about it. 24 And those laws are very, very important for all of us that they 2.5 enforce and people abide by them. But on the other hand,

2.5

```
you've got to look at the 3553 factors. And have you ever seen a case, ever seen a case ever in your career, Mr. Campana, that there were more 3553 factors for the Court to consider other than here?

Because I -- and I have had more cases that you've
```

had and I do this every day and I sentence every day. I can't recall a case that has more 3553 factors.

Now, certainly the fact that he brought that young woman involved in this thing, the fact that he violated the law, those factors certainly have to be carefully considered. And they are important — there's no question about it — in the administration of justice, but the 3553 factors have to be considered too. And when you consider them, they're pretty strong on this case, in my opinion. They seem to be overwhelming. And it was just — it was the whole range of where these letters came from. That's what kind of really impressed me. And there was a constant theme here, and that is that he was — devoted his life to healing. Not to performance enhancements, not to do anything other than to practice medicine to the best of his ability. And some individuals indicated he's like the top of his field.

So what is to be gained if he were to serve, let's say, a year in prison?

A deterrent factor?

MR. CAMPANA: Yes, that; and respect for the law.

```
1
               THE COURT:
                         Deterrence is an absolutely
 2
     overwhelming -- let me tell you something. When I first got
     this report -- well, I'll tell you in a little while -- you
 3
 4
     know, this is, from reading everything, and you have to almost
 5
     life in a cave not to be aware. There's been a lot of
 6
    publicity in this case, and it's been painted many reports very
 7
    different than from the reports that I read here in this court
 8
    proceeding.
               So tell me why you think that a period of
 9
10
     incarceration would serve the general good? Why would it serve
11
     the interest of the United States? And I know deterrence is
12
     important, but you have a lot of factors here. You've got
13
     factors of, you know, someone commits a crime, there's a degree
    of accountability that varies. Someone who robs a bank who
14
15
     really probably didn't do much in his life, obviously he'll go
     to prison, but there's not a lot of collateral damage. Not as
16
17
    much at least from a man who was -- is well-recognized in the
18
     community as being on the cutting edge of the medical
19
    profession.
20
               I interrupted you.
               MR. CAMPANA: Yes.
21
22
               THE COURT: I know --
23
               MR. CAMPANA: No, I appreciate the question.
24
               THE COURT: But I do -- deterrence is a driving force
25
    here for me, let me tell you.
```

```
MR. CAMPANA: Judge, this isn't either for the
 1
 2
     government and for the Court.
 3
               THE COURT: No, this is not an easy case for me,
    Mr. Campana.
 4
 5
               MR. CAMPANA: I was going to say -- I was going to
 6
     say it's not a ground ball.
 7
               THE COURT: It's not an easy case for anybody.
 8
              MR. CAMPANA: It is not a ground ball or a routine
    pop fly or anything of the sort, but there's two aspects that
 9
10
     can be looked at here. Today was an occasion for the defense
     to talk about the defendant, Dr. Galea, because the Court has
11
12
     to sentence a man. And part of what the Court does is sentence
13
     a man for who he is and who he's been, but I want the Court to
    be mindful, as I know it will be, to be conscious also of the
14
15
     offense, and I would just remind the Court, in case it needs
16
     reminding, and it I'm sure it doesn't --
17
               THE COURT: I think your position is that --
18
              MR. CAMPANA:
                            This was serious.
19
               THE COURT: -- challenging Mr. Mahoney on some of the
20
     issues that he raised were irrelevant, and I basically in some
21
     degree I agree with you on that.
22
              MR. CAMPANA:
                            The repeated -- the repeated conduct
23
     and putting others in jeopardy including some of the patients.
24
    As long as the Court's sentence is mindful of those two things,
2.5
    what the offense conduct was, I understand the Court's need
```

```
1
     also to account for the man Dr. Galea has been represented to
 2
    be.
 3
               THE COURT: Let me go over some of those 3553
 4
     factors, and this is the controlling issue for the Court to
 5
     always consider. Factors to be considered in imposing
 6
     sentence: The Court shall impose a sentence sufficient but not
 7
     greater than necessary to comply with the purposes set forth in
 8
    paragraph 2; the nature and circumstances of the offense; and
     the history and characteristics of the defendant; the need for
 9
10
     the sentence to be imposed to reflect the seriousness of the
11
     offense and promote respect for the law; and provide just
12
    punishment for the offense before adequate deterrence to the
13
     criminal conduct; to protect the public from further crimes of
     the defendant; provide the defendant with needed educational or
14
15
     vocational training, medical care or other correctional
     treatment in the most effective manner. Those are the factors.
16
               MR. CAMPANA: We don't think he needs the medical
17
18
     care, and the last, but the two --
19
               THE COURT: You have to protect him from the public.
20
               MR. CAMPANA: The two most important things, Your
21
     Honor, are deterrence and respect for the law.
22
               THE COURT: I agree with that.
23
               MR. CAMPANA: And it is naturally the case, I
24
    believe.
2.5
               THE COURT: Any question at all about the
```

```
remorsefulness here, challenge --
 1
 2
               MR. CAMPANA: Up until yesterday, yes, Your Honor,
    but when we received that -- we received the letters from
 3
 4
     yesterday, especially Dr. Galea's letter --
               THE COURT: Well, he had -- there was a first letter
 5
     that he wrote. This was the second letter.
 6
 7
               MR. CAMPANA: That was published or that was filed
 8
     yesterday.
               THE COURT: There was another letter though in the --
 9
10
     letter number one, I believe.
11
               MR. CAMPANA: That was --
12
               THE COURT: Am I right on that?
1.3
               MR. CAMPANA: That was filed yesterday.
14
               THE COURT: Yeah. Oh, no, I'm sorry.
15
               MR. MAHONEY: I don't believe so, Judge.
16
               THE COURT: There was so many letters.
17
               MR. CAMPANA: Yesterday was the first time that we
18
    heard that he regretted placing --
19
               THE COURT: I was waiting to see that because the
20
    young woman was in here.
21
               MR. CAMPANA: We waited for that too.
22
                          And I don't know whether -- I believe it
               THE COURT:
23
    was a sincere statement. I have no reason to believe
24
     otherwise.
               Anything further?
2.5
```

1 MR. CAMPANA: No. 2 THE COURT: I need a break. We've been going an hour and 20 minutes. Let's take a 15-minute break. The Court will 3 4 be in recess. (A recess was taken at 2:20 p.m.) 5 THE COURT: Are we ready? 6 7 MR. CAMPANA: We are. 8 THE COURT: Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it's the judgement of the Court that the defendant is 9 10 hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be 11 in prison for a period of time served. The cost of incarceration fee is waived. 12 13 He shall be placed on supervised release for a period of one year. While on supervised release, he shall not commit 14 15 another federal, state or local crime; shall be prohibited from 16 possessing a firearm or other dangerous device. In addition, 17 he shall not possess a controlled substance. Shall comply with the standard conditions adopted by the Court. 18 Since the defendant is a Canadian citizen and will 19 20 return to Canada, he shall not reenter or attempt to reenter 21 the United States without written authorization of the 22 Secretary of Homeland Security. Reentry into the United States 23 without approval of the Secretary of Homeland Security will 24 constitute new criminal conduct which may subject the defendant

to criminal prosecution. Reentry without approval during the

2.5

term of supervision will be considered a violation of the 1 2 conditions of supervised release. Because he is a resident of the city of -- citizen of 3 Canada, the term of supervised release shall be unsupervised. 4 In view of the fact that there is a 275,000 civil 5 6 forfeiture that he has already paid, as I understand it. 7 MR. CAMPANA: Yes. 8 MR. MAHONEY: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. The Court does not feel that an 9 additional fine is warranted. The Court will waive the fine. 10 11 However, I will order the mandatory special 12 assessment of \$100 which is due immediately. I would suggest 13 that he make that payment today. 14 MR. MAHONEY: Yes, Judge. 15 THE COURT: In determining the sentence, the Court 16 has considered the advisory guideline range and the points 17 raised by the counsel for the defendant -- the defendant and 18 the government as to what the appropriate sentence should be. 19 In addition, I have considered the factors set forth 20 in 18 U.S.C. 3553(a) and finds the sentence imposed is 21 sufficient, but not greater than necessary to comply with the 22 purpose of sentencing set forth in 18 U.S.C. 3553(a). 23 I have sentenced to a non-guideline sentence to time 24 served. The Court notes that during the period set forth in 2.5 the indictment, even though he only pleaded to Count 3, that

this whole activity took place from February, 2007, to September, 2009, he was a citizen and a resident of Canada and was a physician licensed to practice medicine in the Province of Ontario. He was not licensed to practice medicine in the United States.

He continues to operate a medical business practice today in Canada known as the Institute of Sports Medicine

Health and Wellness Center. During the relevant time period

Ms. Catalano was employed by the defendant and worked as his assistant.

I note that he is a lifelong resident of the Province of Ontario. He's raised with a very supportive and loving environment where athletics and education were encouraged. He's been married on two occasions and has seven children ranging from the age of three to twenty-two. He's obviously well-educated and no prior record; no history of substance abuse.

He appears to be a soft-spoken, humble man as evidenced by the extensive letters of support. Appears to be a well-respected and well-liked member of the medical profession, and certainly is respected by the number of patients that he has treated over the years.

There's no question that he embarked on a career of sports medicine striving to be on the cutting edge of treating injuries related to patients' muscles, tendons and joints

without the need for surgical procedures over the course of his career. There's no question he sought to educate himself or treat patients utilizing at the time unconventional methods in an effort to provide better medical care for patients.

I conclude from reading the materials that his travel to Israel to practice there for a time was motivated in part for a desire to enhance his skills and learn different techniques for patients. He has reportedly treated thousands of patients for various athletic ability injuries, provided consultation for professional sports teams and treatment.

Appears to have led other professional athletes to experience a myriad of injuries to seek out his services.

While the -- his legal inability to practice medicine in the United States is a pertinent part of the facts involved in this case, the reality is that he's pleaded guilty to bringing misbranded drugs into the United States. He's acknowledged that. He realizes that he should have been more truthful with both the intent of entering the United States in a manner in which he used to treat his athletes.

There's no question he's paying a huge price for his misdeeds. He has been portrayed in the media as a performance enhancing physician, although there's no evidence that I have seen, or the government's presented to me that that's true.

His practice has a -- as I understand it, a practice that's still very viable. But there's no question he suffered

irreparable harm as a result of this conviction. The defendant appears to be -- have a genuine desire to be a healer, and apparently his focus on providing his current optimal treatment for his patients ultimately led to this consequence which he's here today.

I believe that the primary interest is and has been from healing injuries. However, he appears to have been impatient and reportedly sought some direction or made some attempts to obtain a visa and permission to work in this country. His choice put himself above the law, and to engage in conduct that has seriously tarnished his reputation, diminished his career and been very financially detrimental to himself and his family. He obviously has no one to blame but himself.

The Court finds that a period of incarceration would not outweigh the benefit of what he has to offer to his patients. He appears to be genuinely remorseful and contrite.

I was -- we talked earlier about Ms. Catalano and that letter that I received last night suggesting his true remorse as to what he caused her, and he indicated that in Court today, and I certainly have no reason to believe that.

I also was very impressed with the letters filed on his behalf. I don't remember ever in my career receiving such a cross-section of letters from so many people of saying such wonderful things about him which obviously had an impact on

this Court.

2.5

I know that there is a pending matter in Canada for conduct similar to here. I don't know exactly what that's going to result in but he's still -- he's going to have to deal with the Canadian laws. It's unlikely that he'll ever be able to practice law (sic) in this country and that whether he'll ever be able to be admitted to the United States is something that this Court has no jurisdiction in.

I note that he's paid this civil forfeiture of \$275,000 which was certainly a large amount of money, and apparently that was part of the plea agreement that he entered into.

The United States also agreed to dismiss the other four counts in the indictment, and obviously the Court thought that this was an important consideration, not only to require him to plead to the major count.

I am not imposing a fine. I believe the civil forfeiture is adequate compensatory payment for him to make.

Sir, you have a right to appeal this sentence if you feel the Court misapprehended its authority or it imposed an illegal sentence. However, you did waive your right to appeal. If you feel that waiver is not a valid waiver, you may take that issue up before the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Campana.

MR. CAMPANA: We ask that the open counts be

```
1
     dismissed. Those would be 1 and 2, and 4 and 5.
2
               THE COURT: Motion's granted.
 3
               Anything further, Mr. Mahoney?
               MR. MAHONEY: No, Judge.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Mr. Campana, anything further?
 6
               MR. CAMPANA: No.
7
               THE COURT: All right. The Court will be in recess.
 8
               MR. MAHONEY: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
 9
               (Proceedings concluded at 2:42 p.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcription of the proceedings stenographically recorded by me in this matter. S/Yvonne M. Garrison, RPR YVONNE M. GARRISON, RPR Official Reporter U.S.D.C., W.D.N.Y.